

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 16, 2010. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-13 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 are the independent claims, and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the cited *Moseley* document, and in addition, independent Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moseley* in view of the cited *Padwick* document “Using Microsoft Outlook 2002” document.

Independent Claim 2 is directed to an information power supply comprising a control unit. When a notice “scheduled” date arrives while the claimed information power supply is in a power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, the control unit provides a notification of any “schedule” as to which a reminder has not yet been given and for which an indicated notice time is not more than a predetermined time in the past before the date when the power supply is powered ON. On the other hand, the control unit does not provide such a reminder as to any “schedules” as to which the indicated notice time is more than the predetermined time in the past before the date when the power supply is powered ON.

Moseley relates to a system in which a user can instruct that a reminder be given for a schedule item, and can how long before the schedule-item time (due date) the reminder is displayed. For example, the user may specify four days for that period, and then a reminder will be displayed four days before the due date.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Moseley*, that would in any way suggest an arrangement having a control unit that provides such control that, when a notice "scheduled" date comes while the apparatus is in a power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, a notification of "schedule" as to which a reminder has not yet been given and for which an indicated notice time is not more than a predetermined time in the past before a date when the power supply is powered ON, as a reminder, is provided, and any reminder as to a "schedule" as to which an indicated notice time is more than the predetermined time in the past before the date when the power supply is powered ON, is not provided, as recited in Claim 2.

Independent Claim 4 is directed to a computer-implemented method of controlling an information apparatus, in which, in a registration step, there are registered a plurality of "schedules" each having a date set, in accordance with a user's operation, and in a notification step, when a notice "scheduled" date arrives while the information apparatus is in a power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, there is provided a notification of any "schedule" as to which no reminder has yet been given, and as to which the indicated notice time is not more than a predetermined time before the date when the power supply is powered ON, as a reminder. According to Claim 4, when a notice "scheduled" date comes while the apparatus is in the power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, then in the notification step no notification is provided of any "schedule" whose indicated notice time is more than the predetermined time before the date when the power supply is powered ON.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in either *Moseley* or *Padwick* that would suggest in any way a method in which, when a notice "scheduled" date arrives while the information apparatus is in a power-OFF status and then the power supply is

powered ON, there is provided a notification of any “schedule” as to which no reminder has yet been given, and as to which the indicated notice time is not more than a predetermined time before the date when the power supply is powered ON, as a reminder, and in which, when a notice “scheduled” date comes while the apparatus is in the power-OFF status and then the power supply is powered ON, then in the notification step no notification is provided of any “schedule” whose indicated notice time is more than the predetermined time before the date when the power supply is powered ON, as recited in Claim 4.

Each of the other independent claims is believed also to be allowable for the reasons set out above with regard to Claims 2 and 4.

The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 5540659v1